

Serial No. 09/512,411

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over La Porta in view of Redlich.

Claims 3, 7, 10, 12 to 14 and 16 to 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over La Porta in view of Redlich in view of Willkie.

Claims 4, 11, 15 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over La Porta in view of Redlich in view of Willkie in view of Kidder.

It is respectfully submitted that Redlich (US patent 6,591,306) does not constitute prior art. Redlich claims a priority date of 1st April 1999. However, the priority date of the present application is 26th February 1999. Attention is directed to the Foreign Applications section of the filing receipt which claims priority to the European Community patent application EPO 99301481.0 filed 02/26/1999.

In the event that a proper claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 was not previously made, applicants do so now. The basis for priority is the membership of the European Community in the World Trade Organization (WTO). The application on which the priority claim is based was filed in the European Patent Office. Applicants believe that a certified copy of the priority application has been filed with the USPTO. Therefore, Applicants believe that all the requirements necessary to claim priority have been complied with. Hence, it is requested that the priority claim be recognized in the next Office Communication, and if the priority claim cannot be recognized, the deficiency therein should be identified so that applicants may correct it.

It follows that the rejections for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) fall away as all rely on Redlich, in combination with other documents.

Note that clarifying amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 12, and 16 so as to make explicit that the reply message is modified in the sense of having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address in place of the mobile node's home address.

Serial No. 09/512,411

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325**.

Respectfully,

X. Chen
I. Kriaras
A. Paparella

By 
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 10/10/05